UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,034	05/02/2007	Robert Bucki	46406-0109-01US [222641]	9154
	7590 06/19/200 DDLE & REATH	EXAMINER		
	LECTUAL PROPERT	DEVI, SARVAMANGALA J N		
ONE LOGAN SQUARE 18TH AND CHERRY STREETS PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-6996			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/574,034	BUCKI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	S. Devi, Ph.D.	1645				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 M</u>	av 2007					
	action is non-final.					
<i>7</i>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 27-47</u> is/are pending in the application.						
·— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
8) Claim(s) 1 and 27-47 are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement					
o) Claim(s) <u>rand 27-47</u> are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some coll None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) A) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Discrete of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						

Restriction & Species Election

- 1) Claim 1 has been amended.
 - Claims 2-26 have been canceled.
 - New claims 27-47 have been added.
 - Claims 1 and 27-47 are under prosecution.
- 2) Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1 and 27-38, drawn to a method for increasing the concentration of gelsolin in a patient's blood or extracellular fluid comprising administering gelsolin *in vitro* or *in vivo*, classified in class 424, subclass 9.2
 - II. Claim 39, drawn to a method for blocking bacterial LPS-induced pathogenesis comprising administering gelsolin, classified in class 514, subclass 921
 - III. Claims 40-42, drawn to a method for restoring normal aggregation of platelets in the blood or extracellular fluid of a patient comprising administering gelsolin to the blood or the extracellular fluid, classified in class 424, subclass 532
 - IV. Claim 43, drawn to a method for blocking fibrinolysis comprising administering to blood or extracellular fluid an actin-binding compound, classified in class 514, subclass 2
 - V. Claims 44 and 45, drawn to a method of predicting an adverse clinical outcome associated with massive gram negative bacterial-caused inflammation comprising measuring the circulating gelsolin concentration in patient, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1
 - VI. Claims 46 and 47, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition for use in the method of invention I comprising gelsolin or a functionally equivalent peptide fragment thereof, classified in class 424, subclass 530
- 3) Inventions I-VI are independent and distinct from one another. While invention VI is directed to a product, inventions I-V are directed to distinct methods, which differ from one another in *in vitro* or *in vivo* method steps and parameters, method objectives, and the ultimate goals accomplished, requiring separate, non-coextensive and burdensome searches.
- 4) Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all the inventions

Application/Control Number: 10/574,034 Art Unit: 1645 June. 2009

listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification/subclassification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention; and
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
- Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are

readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, Applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should Applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, Applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants, or Applicant should clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In

Application/Control Number: 10/574,034 Art Unit: 1645 June. 2009

either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 6) The application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: (a) Blood (claims 1, 27, 30, 31, 38, 41, 43 and 45); and (b) Extracellular fluid (claims 1, 27, 30, 31, 41, 43 and 45). Claims 29, 32-37, 40, 42 and 44 are generic.
- The application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: (I) *In vivo* (class 424) (claims 1, 28, 29, 31-34, 36, 40, 42 and 43); and (II) *In vitro* (class 435) (claims 1, 31, 33, 36, 40 and 43). Claims 27, 30, 35, 37, 38 and 41 are generic.
- 8) The species identified above are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on

the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and a search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different filed of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C § 101 and/or 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be

Application/Control Number: 10/574,034 Art Unit: 1645

June, 2009

considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, Applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should Applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, Applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, Applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

- Papers related to this application may be submitted to the central RightFax number (571) 273-8300, which receives transmissions 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. The transmission of such papers by facsimile must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30, November 15, 1989.
- 10) Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAG or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.Mov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAA system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (in USA or CANADA) or 571-272-1000.
- 11) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to S. Devi, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0854. A message may be left on the Examiner's voice mail system. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7.15 a.m. to 4.15 p.m. except one day each bi-week, which would be disclosed on the Examiner's voice mail system.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Robert Mondesi, can be reached on (571) 272-0956.

/S. Devi/ **Primary Examiner** AU 1645

June, 2009